

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-6 are pending in this application. In the Office Action, the pending claims were rejected as follows. Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Haas et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 2004/0025018).

In the Office Action, Claim 1 was rejected as allegedly being anticipated by *Haas*. *Haas* discloses a method for providing a secure routing protocol for a mobile ad hoc network that requires only that the communicating end nodes have a security association (See Abstract.). In particular, the Examiner alleges in page 3 of the Office Action that paragraphs 0017-0029 and 0037-0052 of *Haas* disclose and teach essentially all of the limitations recited in independent Claim 1. However, after reviewing *Hass*, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In this case, although the Examiner states that *Haas* discloses a MAC (Medium Access Control) protocol module that process data frames and control frames transferred from a MANET (Mobile Ad Hoc Network) protocol layer module, the Examiner has not provided specific sections of *Haas* which discloses this limitation. Moreover, after reading the above-cited sections of *Haas*, a reference to a method for transmitting/receiving frames between a MAC protocol layer module and a MANET protocol layer module in a station receiving frames transmitted through a MANET including a plurality of stations, as presently claimed in the application, was not found.

Furthermore, the recitations of (1) distinguishing between control frames and data frames when analyzing frames transferred from the MANET protocol layer module; (2) providing the control frames with a higher priority than the data frames, thereby enabling the control frames to preempt a medium earlier than the data frames; and (3) transmitting the control frames and the data frames in an order according to their respective priorities, as recited by Claim 1, were also not found in the cited sections of *Haas*.

In contrast to that which is claimed in the present application, *Haas* merely teaches that a secure routing protocol combines a secure route discovery protocol and a secure message transmission protocol (SMT) to provide comprehensive security for Mobile Ad Hoc Network (MANET) routing protocols. Essentially, *Haas* teaches a method for limiting the security flaws (i.e. communication trustworthiness) inherent with the peer-to-peer node interaction associated with MANET protocols. Hence, *Haas* has nothing to do with a method that limits data loss and increases data throughput by providing a MAC protocol layer module that transmits control frames before transmitting data frames so as to quickly form a seamless routing path, as claimed by the present application.

Accordingly, as *Haas* does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C §102(e), it is respectfully submitted that Claim 6 includes similar recitations as those contained in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant believes that Claim 6 is patentably distinct for at least the same reasons as set forth above with respect to the rejection of Claim 1.

In addition, since Claims 2-5 are dependent claims, if the above arguments place independent Claim 1 into condition for allowance, then these dependent claims will also be in condition for allowance.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-6 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

THE FARRELL LAW FIRM
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-3565
Fax: (516) 228-8475

PJF/CEA/fl